REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Final Office Action mailed December 19, 2011 ("Final Office Action"), and respectfully request reconsideration of the subject application, particularly in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Davenport for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview on February 21, 2012 ("Interview"). The undersigned discussed with Examiner Davenport the claim language that was the basis of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 in the Final Office Action, and it is believed that Examiner Davenport has reconsidered such rejection.

Applicants also discussed generally the embodiment recited in claim 1 with respect to the cited references. No agreement regarding the allowability of the claims was reached.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1–5, 8–24, 27, and 28 were previously pending. Claims 6, 7, 25, and 26 were previously cancelled. New claim 29 represents claim 28 rewritten in independent form. Claim 28 has been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1–5, 8–24, 27, and 29 are pending.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Patent Office for the indication that claim 28 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. New claim 29 represents claim 28 rewritten in independent form, and thus should be allowable.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Garahi, Csapo, and Wirbel

Claims 1–5, 8–24, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0091010 A1 to Garahi et al. (hereinafter "Garahi") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0253984 A1 to Csapo et al. (hereinafter "Csapo"), and further in view of "IEEE 802.16 Spec Could Disrupt Wireless Landscape" by Loring Wirbel and Patrick Mannion (hereinafter "Wirbel"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

In the Final Office Action, the Patent Office asserts that Applicants' claim language is unclear (Final Office Action, pg. 19). Specifically, the Patent Office suggests that it is "unclear how backhaul traffic is utilized by the second level ad hoc wireless mesh. Its is [sic] not clear what 'other of' represent in the claim language" (Final Office Action, pg. 19). The Patent Office's confusion relates to the following limitation:

> ... a wireless mesh relay point configured to operate utilizing at least one IEEE 802.16x standard to serve as a backhaul relay point in a second level ad-hoc wireless mesh network implemented using the at least one IEEE 802.16x standard, the second level ad-hoc wireless mesh network being different from the first level ad-hoc wireless mesh network and being utilized to implement the wireless backhaul network, the wireless mesh relay point adapted to send at least some of the backhaul traffic onto the second level ad-hoc wireless mesh network for transmission off the second level ad-hoc wireless mesh network by another backhaul relay point, and to send other of the backhaul traffic directly off the second level ad-hoc wireless mesh network, the wireless backhaul network interconnecting the first level ad-hoc wireless mesh network with higher bandwidth communication resources. (Emphasis added).

As discussed during the Interview, the recited limitation relates to backhaul traffic. "Traffic," as defined, for example, by The Free Dictionary, comprises a "volume of messages transmitted through a communications system in a given period." (See, e.g., definition 6, of "Traffic", http://www.thefreedictionary.com/traffic.) Thus, Applicants' recited limitation says that some of the traffic (i.e., some messages of the volume of messages) is sent onto the second level ad-hoc wireless network for transmission off the second level network by another relay point, and other of the traffic (i.e., other messages of the volume of messages) is sent directly off the second level ad-hoc wireless network. During the Interview, it is believed that the Examiner agreed that this language was sufficiently clear and therefore comported with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

For the reasons discussed in the Response to the Office Action Mailed May 20, 2011 ("Previous Response"), such reasons reproduced below for the convenience of the Patent Office, Applicants submit that none of the cited references teach or suggest an inter-mesh communication point with these features, and that claims 1, 15 and 27 are therefore allowable over the cited references.

As discussed in the Previous Response, Applicants' claim 1 relates to an embodiment wherein an inter-mesh communication point ("ICP") includes a wireless mesh access point that serves as a destination point in a first wireless mesh network, and a wireless mesh relay point in a second wireless mesh network. Thus, the recited mobile ICP bridges two wireless mesh networks, and is capable of bridging traffic between the two wireless mesh networks while moving about. Moreover, the wireless mesh relay point is:

> *...adapted to send at least some of the backhaul traffic onto the second level ad-hoc wireless mesh network for transmission off the second level ad-hoc wireless mesh network by another backhaul relay point, and to send other of the backhaul traffic directly off the second level ad-hoc wireless mesh network...*

None of the cited references teach or suggest many of these features.

Among other features, Garahi discloses the use of mobile access points capable of relaying traffic from subscribers toward a fixed access point that is coupled to a wired backhaul network (Garahi, Figure 6 and paragraph 0039). The mobile access points operate essentially as relay points or routers, and thus are not adapted to work on different mesh networks, as recited in Applicants' claim 1. Garahi discloses that the fixed access points are wired, and simply receive subscriber traffic from the mobile access points and sends the subscriber traffic toward a core LAN. Thus, the fixed access points are not "*adapted to send at least some of the backhaul traffic onto the second level ad-hoc wireless mesh network for transmission off the second level ad-hoc wireless mesh network by another backhaul relay point, and to send other of the backhaul traffic directly off the second level ad-hoc wireless mesh network,*" as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Csapo discloses a stationary (i.e., non-mobile) access point that receives 802.11 traffic and sends out CDMA2000 traffic to base stations (Csapo, Abstract and Figure 2, element 233). Nowhere does Csapo teach or suggest that the access point operates in a wireless mesh network, utilizes 802.16 technology, or is "*adapted to send at least some of the backhaul traffic onto the second level ad-hoc wireless mesh network for transmission off the second level ad-hoc wireless mesh network by another backhaul relay point, and to send other of the backhaul traffic directly off the second level ad-hoc wireless mesh network.*"

Wirbel discloses the use of 802.16 technology as a backhaul technology, but fails to disclose the use of 802.16 technology in a "*wireless mesh network,*" as recited in Applicants' claim 1, nor does Wirbel disclose a relay point that is "*adapted to send at least some of the* *backhaul traffic onto the second level ad-hoc wireless mesh network for transmission off the second level ad-hoc wireless mesh network by another backhaul relay point, and to send other of the backhaul traffic directly off the second level ad-hoc wireless mesh network*," as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

To summarize, none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest a wireless mesh relay point that is "*adapted to send at least some of the backhaul traffic onto the second level ad-hoc wireless mesh network for transmission off the second level ad-hoc wireless mesh network by another backhaul relay point, and to send other of the backhaul traffic directly off the second level ad-hoc wireless mesh network.*" Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 15 and 27 contain analogous limitations to those discussed herein with regard to claim 1, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 2–5 and 8–14 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, and thus include all of the features and limitations of claim 1, and are therefore allowable for at least the reason that such claims depend from an allowable independent claim. Claims 16–24 depend directly or indirectly from claim 15, and thus include all of the features and limitations of claim 15, and are therefore allowable for at least the reason that such claims depend from an allowable independent claim.

Conclusion

The present application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative regarding any remaining issues in an effort to expedite allowance and issuance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.

By:

Eric P. Jensen
Registration No. 37,647
100 Regency Forest Drive, Suite 160
Cary, NC 27518
Telephone: (919) 238-2300

Date: March 19, 2012
Attorney Docket: 7000-704